

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CURTIS. Very well. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without losing the privilege of the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, can the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska be acted upon at this time relative to the time and the retention of the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smith of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, throughout the country the American public is greatly alarmed over the ever-growing menace created by Communist power in Cuba.

This alarm is well founded.

There have been a number of official statements issued by the U.S. Government in the past few days concerning the situation in Cuba, but these statements are obviously designed to allay the distress of the American public while the United States does nothing to alleviate the cause of the alarm.

Last week in his press conference the President, in answer to questions, stated that the Monroe Doctrine was still a part of U.S. foreign policy and that action would be taken under the Monroe Doctrine to prevent any export of communism to other parts of the Americas by military force or threat of force.

The President's comments indicate strongly that the Monroe Doctrine has recently been reinterpreted with major omissions to the extent that the Monroe Doctrine is no longer a bulwark of U.S. foreign policy which it was for over a 100 years.

The Monroe Doctrine was announced on December 2, 1823, by President James Monroe as a part of his annual message to Congress. This bold pronouncement was in the best tradition of "open diplomacy" and far more productive than the unostentatious diplomatic protests which have become so routine in our modern conduct of diplomatic affairs. It demonstrated to the world that the then small United States more than made up for its relatively weak military position with strong convictions and determination. This declaration put the world on notice that the United States would tolerate no outside intervention in the Americas.

Since its pronouncement, the Monroe Doctrine has served as the basis of direct and indirect U.S. action on a number of occasions. It was the basis for direct U.S. military intervention in Cuba in 1906, in 1912, and again in 1917.

In 1849, Spain was believed to be negotiating with England with a view toward ceding Cuba to England. The full impact of the Monroe Doctrine was contained in a message imparted to the Spanish Ambassador by the U.S. State

Department. The Spanish Ambassador was told:

This Government is resolutely determined that the island of Cuba shall never be ceded by Spain to any other power than the United States. The cession of Cuba to any foreign power would, in the United States, be the instant signal for war.

This message was delivered in a period, of course, when Spain and all other foreign powers believed with good reason that the United States would fight, if necessary, to protect its vital interests, and, therefore, war in 1849 was unnecessary.

The historical import of the Monroe Doctrine is that the United States will not tolerate outside intervention in the Americas and that the United States will take whatever measures are necessary to prevent outside intervention in the Americas, including the use of military force.

Cuba is a part of the Americas. There is now and has been outside intervention in Cuba. There are today Soviet military forces in Cuba by our own Government's admission. The Communist government of Cuba is a puppet of the Soviet Union. The United States State Department takes the position that Cuba is a part of the Sino-Soviet Bloc. Under these circumstances there can be no question but that the Soviet Union and the Communist puppet government of Cuba are right now, as they have been for some time, flaunting the Monroe Doctrine. Even our State Department cannot deny this.

To say that the United States will take action under the Monroe Doctrine if there is an attempt to export communism from Cuba to other parts of the Americas by force or threat of force, is but to admit that the Monroe Doctrine has not been applied by the United States in the case of Cuba itself, and to admit that an exception has been made to that Doctrine. It is to admit that the clear historical meaning of the Monroe Doctrine has been abandoned as a cornerstone of United States foreign policy and that there has been substituted therefor, in desecration of the name of the Monroe Doctrine, a policy of expediency, hesitation, and indecision. If an exception to the Monroe Doctrine is made in the case of Cuba to avoid a direct confrontation of Communist power, how can we expect the Communists to believe that we will not make another exception for their further encroachment in the Americas?

After one exception can the American people believe that another exception will not be made if the Communists move into Costa Rica or Guatemala? Can our Latin American neighbors have any confidence that the United States will be any more resolute in coming to their aid against communism than in the case of Cuba, when the judgment of our Latin American neighbors must be reached by balancing the oral assurances of our Government against the U.S. record of inaction against foreign intervention in Cuba? How can we expect our European and Asian allies to have faith that we will stand firmly by their side

against the forces of communism, when we have not taken firm action on Cuba, which adjoins our own shores?

A Monroe Doctrine, invariably enforced, is a pillar of strength on which the American people and our allies could place confidence. A Monroe Doctrine reinterpreted to permit exceptions for the sake of expediency is but a reed in the wind on which no one can put a finger, much less place faith.

Too many fundamental principles which have formed the foundation on which our Nation has achieved greatness are being sacrificed and abandoned to the realm of relativity through the process of reinterpretation. The Monroe Doctrine, which has constituted the one unwavering element of our foreign policy since 1823, must not be allowed to become a hollow and irrelevant cliché as a result of expedient redefinition in order to avoid a difficult decision.

The situation in Cuba does present a difficult choice and the responsibility which falls on the present administration in seeking a course designed to successfully resolve it is a heavy one. Americans should be fully apprised of the ramifications of any policy which is adopted toward the Cuban situation. Whatever actions this country takes with regard to Cuba, whether alone or in concert with other nations of the Western Hemisphere, will have far-reaching implications throughout the world, particularly in such trouble spots as Berlin. The complications involved, however, can never justify an abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine nor an underestimation of the menace constituted by a Sino-Soviet base of operations in the Western Hemisphere. The security of the United States and the security of the entire Western Hemisphere are seriously threatened by the Communist domination of Cuba.

Cuba at this time is rapidly being converted into an island fortress. It is small comfort that the emphasis of the present military buildup is along defensive lines, if, indeed, that be the case. The expulsion of Sino-Soviet domination from the Western Hemisphere will constitute a more formidable undertaking with every passing day, and we should have no doubt, in view of their past performance, that the Communists will step up their offensive from Cuba against other American States in direct proportion to their increasing military potential in Cuba.

While it is clear that there is little hope for unanimous action by all the nations of the Western Hemisphere to eradicate Communist tyranny from Cuba, it is impossible not to believe that many, certainly a majority, of the Latin American States would participate with the United States in an action of intervention against the Cuban Communist regime in their own self-defense. Many Latin American nations, particularly those small nations in Central America, are now in dire circumstances due to Communist infiltration, subversion, agitation and propaganda directed against them from Cuba. The longer a decision on Cuba is postponed the less able to

participate will be our Latin American friends; and if the decision is postponed too long, some of them may well by that time have already fallen to the intensive Communist barrage and themselves constitute a part of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

This is no time to follow a "watch and see" or "let the dust settle" policy on Sino-Soviet intervention in the Western Hemisphere. In this matter, time is not on our side.

The application of the Monroe Doctrine in its pertinence to the present situation was clearly set forth in an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of September 5, 1962, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

The year was 1823. Imperialist Russia, filled with ambitions to extend its domain, was pushing its power along the northwest coast of North America. In an alliance with Austria and Prussia, whose territories included parts of what is now East Germany, the Russians were threatening to intervene in revolutions in Central and South America.

In that situation the U.S. Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, proposed and the President of the United States, Mr. Monroe, issued a statement addressed to the European powers.

"We owe it therefore to candor," said the President of the United States, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portions of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The United States, in those days, was a weak country. It comprised less than half its present continental expanse; it numbered barely 9 million people; it had only a small Navy and less Army. It was certainly no such power in the world as Austria, Prussia, France or Imperial Russia. And as a matter of fact, in most of the chancelleries of the world there was contemptuous amusement at President Monroe's bold pretensions.

For they were bold. It took considerable courage for the President to act alone instead of waiting for Great Britain, which had suggested a joint statement but somehow never got around to acting on it. Neither Mr. Adams nor Mr. Monroe were quite sure how they would implement their policy if it were challenged by the great powers. But believing the step necessary to this country's peace and safety, they did not let uncertainty paralyze their decision.

Those quiet words, shorn of all bombast, served their purpose for 140 years, through many tests, because the world came to believe we meant what we said. The Monroe Doctrine did not keep the United States out of wars. It did assure that no foreign power would come to threaten us upon our own doorstep.

Or at least, the Monroe Doctrine did so until our own day.

It can hardly be a secret to anyone that a new imperialist Russia is extending its system to this hemisphere. The system of the present Government of Cuba is the Communist system. And this week the Castro regime signed a military pact with the Soviet Union in which it is frankly and publicly acknowledged that the Soviet Union will help train and provide arms to the Cuban Army.

But a difference between the centuries is that today Secretaries of State and Presi-

dents of the United States have reacted differently. Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have asserted that the Monroe Doctrine is not dead. But up to yesterday neither had chosen to implement it; both have relied instead upon the so-called machinery of the inter-American security system.

That is, the U.S. Government has put its trust in the hope that others will act rather than in acting itself. Where once a weak nation was bold enough to put its shield over the other nations of the hemisphere, a strong nation has hoped that its weak neighbors will somehow rise and shield it from a danger on its own doorstep.

So matters stood until yesterday. Now President Kennedy has issued a statement saying that the Castro government of Cuba will not be permitted to extend its influence further in the Western Hemisphere and strongly implied that the United States will stand by its doctrine of 140 years ago.

Just 2 years ago—in July 1960—Mr. Khrushchev said the Monroe Doctrine was dead. The President of the United States says it is still alive. Now the problem today, as it was in the days of Imperial Russia, is for the United States to convince the world that it means exactly what it says.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished columnist, William S. White, has also done an excellent summation of the Cuban situation in his column appearing in the Washington Evening Star on September 5, 1962, entitled "The Menace of Communist Cuba." I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

(By William S. White)

The Soviet Union's publicly boasted military penetration of the Western Hemisphere in Castro Cuba is many things, apart from the most insolent menace to the New World that the United States has ever tolerated.

It destroys forever the airy assurances of pseudoliberals that revolutionary movements are fine things, indeed—so long as they involve leftwingers and not rightwingers.

It places a terrible responsibility before history upon all those Americans who cheered Fidel Castro on in Cuba long past the point where it was plain that he was transplanting the evil fungus of armed international communism to within 90 miles of our Florida coastline.

UNMASKS COMMUNISM

It bankrupts the whole evangelistic theory, parroted with religious fervor, that communism results from capitalistic injustice, et cetera, and will vanish at once, given the spreading of sufficient welfarism among the masses. Cuba, before Castro, was never half so underprivileged as dozens of other lands which have nevertheless never sought the lethal embrace of Moscow.

It fully supports what has long been fully obvious—that communism, like Hitlerism before it, is a movement of bandit ferocity and cannot be explained by old-lady minds as simply springing from too little milk for the kiddies and too little free land for the workers and peasants.

It brings into the gravest question the practicality of the vast effort being made by the United States through the Alliance for Progress to cure all the ills of Latin America with economic aid. Foreign aid is a sound and splendid thing—when it is given to nations willing and able to use it for free-

dom's strength and openly and unashamedly against communism.

But the bulk of the more powerful Latin American nations, while avidly ready for our economic aid, repeatedly have refused to follow us in any total quarantine of Castro Cuba. It is fashionable to say that we, the United States, should never force our views upon the recipients of our aid. This is the line even when precisely our views are essential to maintain that freedom from foreign domination for which the Latins so endlessly clamor—especially those who have snuggled up closest to international communism.

And brought into question, too, is the very validity of the Organization of American States. This association of the nations of this hemisphere was created to prevent just the kind of foreign penetration which is and long has been so openly involved in Castro Cuba.

But an effective majority of the OAS has thus far been unwilling to take any fully rational step against Castro Cuba. The most ironic of all excuses is given by the nation closest in geography to us, Mexico. She has said that while she would like to help, she just can't find any precedent for it in international practice. There is a sour jest in this—for Mexico, of course, is famous for its scrupulous respect for both law and justice.

COURSE FOR UNITED STATES

So what is now left to the United States? We should try one more time to persuade the Organization of American States to act in honesty and honor against the Soviet cancer in the Caribbean.

Failing this, we should raise a new collective military organization from among the minority who are our real friends in Latin America. Much the same was done in 1949, when we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from within the United Nations when it became clear that the U.N. would do nothing about Soviet aggression in Europe.

And failing this, the United States should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in my weekly report to the people released Monday, September 3, 1962, I pointed out that not only are there Soviet troops in Cuba and missile bases in Cuba, but also there is strong evidence that the Soviets have built or are in the process of building a space satellite tracking station on the north coast of Cuba. Little, if anything, has been reported in the press on the evidence which points to the construction of a Soviet satellite tracking station in this Communist outpost. Although both of the national wire services carried stories concerning my weekly report to the people of September 3 on the Cuban situation, neither made any reference to this particular item. It is interesting to note that in an article released by the United Press International from Mexico City dated September 4, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, September 6, there is related a report that a satellite tracking station is under construction near Bahia Honda in Cuba. Because of rather obvious security implications, it would not be appropriate at this time to publicly discuss the full implications of the existence of a Soviet satellite tracking station in Cuba, only a short distance from the Florida coast and Cape Canaveral. It is sufficient to say that there are very serious implications, some of them of a

military nature. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my weekly report to the people for September 3, 1962, and a copy of a news article entitled "Exiles Release Details of Cuban Arms Buildup," which appeared in the Washington Post for September 6, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBAN POLICY PARALYSIS COSTS

(Weekly newsletter of Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, Sept. 3, 1962)

The policy of the United States on Cuba provides for history an almost perfect record—a perfect record of errors. Castro and communism took over in Cuba without even fighting a battle, much less a war. The takeover was accomplished with an official nod of approval from the United States, plus direct assistance in the form of a U.S. embargo on arms to the Batista government which Castro succeeded in power.

At best, our Government's refusal to acknowledge Castro's Communist ties was an example of gross misjudgment. Castro's participation in the Communist insurrection in Bogotá, Colombia, on April 9, 1948, and the days following, while Castro was "visiting" Bogotá as a member of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, was known to almost every intelligence agency in the Western Hemisphere. Efforts of the Communists to break up the ninth inter-American conference resulted in the murder of countless persons and property damage in Bogotá estimated at over \$21 million. This was a major incident, the files on which should not have been overlooked.

Even after Castro's takeover, our response to the danger was lethargic. Only after Castro's Red government seized properties of American citizens did the United States take Cuba off the preferential sugar quota and break diplomatic relations. The inevitable firing squad purge which follows a Communist takeover went virtually unchallenged.

A plan was finally set in motion to do something about the presence of a Communist outpost in the Americas. The plan formulated and approved called for an invasion of Cuba, financed and sponsored by the United States and carried out by Cuban refugees. The invasion was originally scheduled for November 30, 1960, but was delayed because of the change in administrations. The new administration, like its predecessor, considered the danger of a Communist Cuba so grave as to justify the invasion. It was therefore rescheduled for April 17, 1961.

Then the blunders began in earnest. Instead of keeping Castro in the dark as to what level of force to expect when the invasion began, the United States announced in advance of the invasion that no American forces would go to the aid of a revolution against Cuba's Communist government. This discouraged a popular uprising and took much of the pressure off Castro. The plan called for a second air strike to follow that of April 15 to complete the destruction of Castro's then-meager air force, but at the last minute, diplomatic qualms caused it to be canceled. The invaders were left at the mercy of the Communist forces. The United States denied, then admitted, its major part in the invasion.

Because of timidity and indecision, the justified and necessary invasion became a fiasco. The United States not only had to bear all the criticism which would have followed a successful liquidation of communism

in Cuba, even had U.S. forces been directly committed, but the United States also had to bear the loss of confidence and respect resulting from the obvious incompetence which caused the invasion to fail and the invaders to be sacrificed. Since the ill-fated invasion blunders, our policy toward Communist Cuba can best be described as "timid," and the situation has grown from bad to worse.

Communism is now firmly entrenched in Cuba. The Communists have had more than 2½ years to purge and indoctrinate the Cuban people. Communist agents and specialists from all over the world have been moved into Cuba in large numbers. Castro's military forces are the largest and best equipped—with Russian and Czech arms and jet aircraft—in Latin America. From Cuba flows an ever increasing tide of Communist propaganda and subversion directed at Latin America. There is substantial evidence that there are now at least four intermediate range ballistic missile bases in Cuba. Recent reports strongly indicate that an undetermined number of Soviet military forces has landed in Cuba. There is also every reason to believe that the Soviets have built or are building a space satellite tracking station on the north coast of Cuba. This will constitute a major advantage for the Soviet space program because the Soviets have no other such site available in the Western Hemisphere.

All Latin America is in turmoil because of Communist pressures launched from Cuba. As long as Cuba is Communist controlled, there can be no stability in Latin America. We can't buy our way out with the Alliance for Progress, which has been aptly dubbed the "alliance for socialism." If, as has been proposed, we cut off military aid to Latin American countries, it will create a vacuum of power in all Latin America as it did in Cuba and permit communism to take over without fighting a battle.

The longer the United States waits to expel communism from Cuba, the more difficult will be the job. All Americans are reluctant to commit American men to battle, but it is now clear that it is American liberty at stake. If circumstances in 1960 and early 1961 justified decisions by two administrations that a U.S.-sponsored invasion of Cuba was essential, how can the far worse circumstances of today require less? Inaction can be justified at this point only by a no-win policy of paralysis.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 1962]

EXILES RELEASE DETAILS OF CUBA ARMS BUILDUP

(By Jaime Plenn)

MEXICO CITY, September 4.—A detailed report on distribution of nearly 20,000 Russian, Chinese, Algerian, and African military men, naval and air bases and guided missile launching pads in Cuba was released here today by a Cuban student exile office.

The report, with a map assertedly showing the bases under Soviet control, was obtained from anti-Castro resistance forces "and other sources," according to Angel Gonzalez, head of the Directorio Revolucionario Estudiantil, exiled in Mexico.

The report said that between June 25 and August 15 at least 10,000 military men from behind the Iron Curtain joined the 8,000 foreign mercenaries already in Cuba.

All are disguised as technicians, the statement said.

One missile station is being installed near the port of Bahia Honda in Pinar del Rio Province and another near Varadero Beach in Matanzas Province, the statement said.

Both are on the northwest coast of Cuba about 100 miles from the Florida coast.

"Every province in Cuba has been fortified," the statement declared, and "new concentration camps have been established to hold militia and army officers who protested being displaced by Soviet and Chinese commanders."

More than 3,000 Russians were landed at Bahia Honda for work on a launching pad and a nearby satellite tracking station, the report said. About 15 Russian vessels have been unloading personnel and equipment in recent weeks, it said.

Near Varadero Beach a base has been staffed by 1,500 Russians, Gonzalez declared. Information from the underground, as relayed by the exile student group, is similar to reports made the past week by newly arrived Cuban refugees from Havana.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have waited for the dust to settle in Cuba. The dust which settled is both red and active. It is in the process of contaminating the entire Western Hemisphere. The time has come for Cuba to be decontaminated. The best method of decontamination can be determined with the advice of our military leaders, once the basic decision to decontaminate is made by our civilian leaders.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.